REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the non-final Office Action mailed September 22, 2006. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 19 are pending. More specifically, Applicants amend claims 1 – 10. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Truong spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on October 31, 2006 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Mr. Bonner and Examiner Truong discussed *Cooperman* with regard to claim 1. More specifically, Mr. Bonner submitted that *Cooperman* fails to disclose "providing... an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window" as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Truong carefully consider this response and the amendments.

II.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A.   Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023691

("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0223069 ("*Cooperman*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in

view of *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an email address of the contact of the sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM address to the reference identifier;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the email address to the reference identifier (ID); and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*. *(emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest

a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising...

providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured

to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact*

from the email window" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically,

Knauerhase discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of

11

these potential communications channels… to make routing decisions" (page 4, paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing… *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "*an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Cooperman* discloses a "method and apparatus for providing an IM notification that can provide a notification of a requested IM session…" (page 1, paragraph [0008]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing… *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "*an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as

recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that neither reference suggests "an email window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase* and *Cooperman* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*," claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

B.   Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 5. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

C.   Claim 6 is Allowable Over _Knauerhase_ in view of _Donovan_ and _Cooperman_

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over _Knauerhase_ in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0193722 ("_Donovan_") and _Cooperman_. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that _Knauerhase_ in view of _Donovan_ and _Cooperman_ fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
>
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
>
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
>
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID); and
>
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an _**email window**_ configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for _**launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window**_. _**(emphasis added)**_

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an _**email window**_ configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for _**launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window**_" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, _Knauerhase_ discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of

these potential communications channels… to make routing decisions" (page 4, paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing… an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Donovan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Donovan* teaches an "IM manager [that] includes a database which stores protocols of foreign realms" (Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing… an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Donovan* even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as

amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Cooperman* discloses a "method and apparatus for providing an IM notification that can provide a notification of a requested IM session…" (page 1, paragraph [0008]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing… an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that none of the cited references suggests "an email window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase*, *Donovan*, and *Cooperman* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness… the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest

"providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an *email window* configured

to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual*

contact from the email window," claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

D.   **Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Cooperman***

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication No.

2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and *Cooperman*. Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Cooperman*

fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically,

claim 11 recites:

> A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:
> first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second sender input comprising a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact; and
> email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for

launching an IM session with the individual contact from the
email window*. (emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of these potential communications channels... to make routing decisions" (page 4, paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic... configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. For at least these reasons, claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Donovan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual***

***contact from the email window*"** as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Donovan*

teaches an "IM manager [that] includes a database which stores protocols of foreign

realms" (Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email

window logic... configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the

reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from***

***the email window*"** as recited in claim 11. Additionally, nowhere else does *Donovan*

even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an ***email window***

configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the***

***individual contact from the email window*"** as recited in claim 11. For at least these

additional reasons, claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Cooperman* fails to disclose,

teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location

comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender

location, the email window logic configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to

utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual***

***contact from the email window*"** as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Cooperman*

discloses a "method and apparatus for providing an IM notification that can provide a

notification of a requested IM session..." (page 1, paragraph [0008]). Applicants

respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic... configured to provide

an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM***

***session with the individual contact from the email window*"** as recited in claim 11.

Additionally, nowhere else does *Cooperman* even suggest "providing... an email

window," not to mention "an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier

(ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email***

window" as recited in claim 11. For at least these additional reasons, claim 11, is

allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that none of the references suggest "an email

window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase*, *Donovan*,

and *Cooperman* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a

prima facie case of obviousness… the prior art reference (or references when

combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason

that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "email window

logic… configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference

identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email***

window," claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

E. **Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of**
Donovan and _Cooperman_

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan*

and *Cooperman*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason

that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Cooperman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest

all of the elements of claim 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 –

10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from

allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 are believed to be

allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 11.

In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc., 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

F.   **Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte***

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0030670 ("*Duarte*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an email address of the contact of the sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM address to the reference identifier;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the email address to the reference identifier (ID); and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*. *(emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically,

Knauerhase discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of these potential communications channels... to make routing decisions" (page 4, paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing... *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "*an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses a "system and method of displaying multiple, concurrent instant messaging (IM) sessions..." (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing... *an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "*an email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the*

email window" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these additional

reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that neither reference suggests "an email

window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase* and *Duarte*

is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a prima facie case

of obviousness… the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or

suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the

references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "providing, by the computing

device at the sender location, *an email window* configured to utilize the reference

identifier (ID) *for launching an IM session with the contact from the email window*,"

claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

G. Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Duarte*. Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of

Duarte fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 5. More

specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason

that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota

Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

H. **Claim 6 is Allowable Over _Knauerhase_ in view of _Donovan_ and _Duarte_**

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as allegedly being unpatentable over _Knauerhase_ in view of _Donovan_ and _Duarte_.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that _Knauerhase_ in

view of _Donovan_ and _Duarte_ fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of

claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender
> location, comprising:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location,
> sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant
> messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender,
> the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different
> IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to
> transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a
> reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted
> to identify the individual contact;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location,
> each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID);
> and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an
> **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for
> **launching an IM session with the individual contact from the
> email window**. **(emphasis added)**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest

a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising…

providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an **email window** configured

to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for **launching an IM session with the individual

contact from the email window**" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically,

Knauerhase discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of

these potential communications channels… to make routing decisions" (page 4,

paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing…
an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM
session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as
amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing… an
email window," not to mention "an *email window* configured to utilize the reference
identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email
window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 6, as
amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Donovan* fails to disclose, teach,
or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location,
comprising… providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an *email
window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session
with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as
amended. More specifically, *Donovan* teaches an "IM manager [that] includes a
database which stores protocols of foreign realms" (Abstract). Applicants respectfully
submit that this is different than "providing… an *email window* configured to utilize the
reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from
the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does
Donovan even suggest "providing… an email window," not to mention "an *email
window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session
with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as
amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over
the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses a "system and method of displaying multiple, concurrent instant messaging (IM) sessions..." (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "providing... an **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these additional reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that none of the references suggest "an email window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase*, *Donovan*, and *Duarte* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*," claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

I. Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically, claim 11 recites:

> A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:
>
> first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
>
> second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second sender input comprising a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
>
> correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact; and
>
> email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an **email window** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for **launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window**. *(emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email

window logic configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Knauerhase* discloses a "Routing Decisions component [that] may use one or more of these potential communications channels... to make routing decisions" (page 4, paragraph [0037]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic... configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 11. Additionally, nowhere else does *Knauerhase* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 11. For at least these reasons, claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Donovan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Donovan* teaches an "IM manager [that] includes a database which stores protocols of foreign realms" (Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic... configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from*

the email window**"** as recited in claim 11. Additionally, nowhere else does *Donovan* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. For at least these additional reasons, claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. More specifically, *Duarte* discloses a "system and method of displaying multiple, concurrent instant messaging (IM) sessions..." (page 1, paragraph [0009]). Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than "email window logic... configured to provide an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. Additionally, nowhere else does *Duarte* even suggest "providing... an email window," not to mention "an ***email window*** configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for ***launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window***" as recited in claim 11. For at least these additional reasons, claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

Further, for at least the reason that none of the references suggest "an email window," Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knauerhase, Donovan,* and *Duarte* is improper. More specifically, MPEP §706.02(j) states "[t]o establish a

prima facie case of obviousness… the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations." For at least the reason that none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "email window logic… configured to provide an *email window* configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*," claim 11, is allowable over the cited art.

J.   Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte*

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Duarte* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 11. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**